

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 10, 12 – 26, 28 – 42 and 44 - 50 are pending in the present application. Claims 11, 27 and 43 are canceled by the present amendment, and claim 50 is newly added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The present application is claiming priority of UK Patent Application No. 0225419.1 (hereinafter “the priority application”). On 23 FEB 2004, Applicants submitted a certified copy of the priority application. The Office has not yet acknowledged receipt of the priority application. Applicants respectfully request that in the next communication, the Office **please acknowledge receipt of the priority application.**

In the present application, claims 1, 18 and 33 are independent claims. Applicants are rewriting claims 1, 18 and 33 so that they are more particularly directed toward the subject matter that Applicants wish to protect. More particularly, the claims are now directed toward a mobile gaming platform, as was previously presented in claims 11, 27 and 43. Applicants are also amending all of the claims, except claim 34, to do one or more of (a) provide consistent terminology, (b) ensure an antecedent basis for terms, (c) improve form, (d) improve grammar, (e) delete a recital that does not appear to be necessary for patentability, or (f) avoid a recital of means plus function.

NOTE: In claims 1, 7, 10, 18, 23, 26, 39 and 42, Applicants are deleting hyphens, i.e., “-“, that were previously situated at the beginning of several lines of these claims.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 32 is objected to because the current set of claims contains two occurrences of a claim labeled as claim 32. Applicants are deleting the second occurrence of claim 32. Additionally, Applicants are adding claim 50, which is similar in substance to the deleted version of claim 32. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 3, 8 – 10, 13, 15 – 20, 24, 29, 31-36, 40 – 42, 45 and 47 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,015,344 to Kelly et al. (hereinafter “the Kelly et al. patent”). Claims 1, 18 and 33 are independent claims. Claims 1, 18 and 33 each includes a recital that is not disclosed by the Kelly et al. patent.

Claim 1 provides for a gaming system that includes a game server. The game server, in turn, includes (a) a prize signal generator that generates a prize signal, and (b) a control arrangement that, following the generation of the prize signal, (i) selects an appropriate prize supplier from a prize supplier database, and (ii) communicates, to a player, location information about the appropriate prize supplier.

The Office Action, on page 3, suggests that the Kelly et al. patent, FIG. 9a and the description thereof, disclose communicating location information about an appropriate prize supplier for receipt by a player. Applicants respectfully disagree.

FIG. 9A of the Kelly et al. patent is a diagram of a prize table 468 (col. 35, line 45). None of the fields of prize table 468 provides location information about a prize supplier. Moreover, in a description of prize table 468, the Kelly et al. patent, at col. 45, lines 39 – 42, states:

After the player selects a prize from the prize selection menu, the selection information can be sent to the prize distributor over the network, and the player can be mailed his or her selected prize from the prize supplier.

Thus, none of the fields of prize table 468 provides location information about a prize supplier, and the Kelly et al. patent describes a situation in which selection information is sent to a prize distributor over a network, and the player receives the selected prize by mail. The Kelly et al. patent does not mention communicating location information about the prize distributor. Consequently, the Kelly et al. patent does not disclose a game server that communicates, to a player, **location information about the appropriate prize supplier**, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Kelly et al. patent does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 18 provides for an apparatus that includes a control arrangement that communicates, to a player, location information about an appropriate prize supplier. For reasoning similar to that provided above in support of claim 1, Applicants submit that the Kelly et al. patent does not disclose a control arrangement that communicates, to said player, location information about the appropriate prize supplier, as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants also submit that the Kelly et al. patent does not anticipate claim 18.

Claim 33 provides for a method that includes communicating location information about an appropriate prize supplier for receipt by a player. For reasoning similar to that provided above in support of claim 1, Applicants submit that the Kelly et al. patent does not disclose communicating location information about the appropriate prize supplier for receipt by said player, as recited in claim 33. Accordingly, Applicants also submit that the Kelly et al. patent does not anticipate claim 33.

Claims 2, 3, 8 – 10, 13 and 15 – 17 depend from claim 1. Claims 19, 20, 24, 29, 31 and 32 depend from claim 18. Claims 34 – 36, 40 – 42, 45 and 47 – 49 depend from claim 33. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 2, 3, 8 – 10, 13, 15 – 17, 19, 20, 24, 29, 31, 32, 34 – 36, 40 – 42, 45 and 47 – 49 are all novel over the Kelly et al. patent.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 3, 8 – 10, 13, 15 – 20, 24, 29, 31 – 36, 40 – 42, 45 and 47 – 49.

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 4 – 7, 11, 12, 14, 21 – 23, 25 – 28, 30, 37 – 39, 43, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kelly et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,287,200 to Sharma (hereinafter “the Sharma patent”).

Claims 11, 27 and 43 are canceled. As such, the rejection thereof is rendered moot.

Claims 4 – 7, 12, and 14 depend from claim 1. Claims 21 – 23, 25, 26, 28 and 30 depend from claim 18. Claims 37 – 39, 44 and 46 depend from claim 33. Applicants respectfully submit that the

Sharma patent does not make up for the deficiency of the Kelly et al. patent, as the Kelly et al. patent relates to claims 1, 18 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants further submit that claims 1, 18 and 33, and their respective dependent claims, are all patentable over the cited combination of the Kelly et al. and Sharma patents.


Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 4 – 7, 11, 12, 14, 21 – 23, 25 – 28, 30, 37 – 39, 43, 44 and 46.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

9/13/07



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: 203-327-4500  
Fax: 203-327-6401